



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/505,119	02/16/2000	Joseph D. Revnell	REV02 P-300	5682
277	7590	01/15/2004	EXAMINER	
PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON 695 KENMOOR, S.E. P O BOX 2567 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501			JAGAN, MIRELLYS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2859	
DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 20

Application Number: 09/505,119

Filing Date: February 16, 2000

Appellant(s): REVNELL, JOSEPH D.

**MAILED**

**JAN 15 2004**

**GROUP 2800**

Marcus Dolce  
For Appellant

**SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Vacated  
See Paper # 21

This is in response to the Reply Brief filed 10/20/03.

***Items (1)-(6)***

The Examiner's Answer stands with respect to Items (1)-(6).

***Item (7) Grouping of Claims***

The appellant's statements of the grouping of claims in the Reply Brief are correct. Therefore, a Supplemental Examiner's Answer to Issue 6 is stated below.

***Items (8)-(10)***

The Examiner's Answer stands with respect to Items (8)-(10).

***Item (11) Response to Arguments***

The Examiner's Answer stands with respect to Issues 1-5 and 7-19.

**Issue 6:** Whether claims 5 and 57 are unpatentable over Barker in view of Moxey and Rauch et al.

The Examiner's Answer stands with respect to claim 5.

With respect to claim 57, Appellant states that claim 57 is patentable over Barker in view of Moxey and Rauch et al because neither Barker, Moxey, nor Rauch et al disclose making a mark along the edge of the front leg. These arguments are not persuasive since in adding a tape-guiding leg, as taught by Rauch et al, to the device of Barker, the leg will extend under the tape to support the tape and its edge will form an extension of the edge 22, which is used for

making markings. Therefore, in making markings along the edge of the slot, a marking will also be made along the edge of the front leg since the edge of the front leg is coextensive with the edge of the slot.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

mj  
January 6, 2004

  
Mirellys Jagan  
Assistant Examiner

  
Diego Gutierrez  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800

Diego Gutierrez   
Supervisory Patent Examiner

PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON  
695 KENMOOR, S.E.  
P O BOX 2567  
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501